

UNIVERSITY IMPACT DISTRICT REVIEW BOARD

111 North Front Street, Third Floor

Columbus, Ohio 43215

P (614) 645-6096 F (614) 645-6675

MEETING SUMMARY

date	November 15, 2018
place	Michael B Coleman Government Center Hearing Room 111 North Front Street, Room 205
time	4:00pm – 7:00pm
present	Pasquale Grado, Frank Petruziello, Kay Bea Jones, Keoni Fleming, Kerry Reeds, Doreen Uhas Sauer, Steven Papineau
absent	none

A.	Applications for Certificate of Approval	
1. address	1428 North High Street	Domino's
app no.:	UID_18-11-003	
applicant:	Michael Cox/ DaNite Sign Co/ Domino's	
reviewed:	Signs	
4:05 – 4:20		
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.• Mr. Cox presented the proposal.	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Petruziello stated that the blade sign should not exceed 8" thick, that the raceway should be painted to match the brick, and that there be a cover over the mounting bolts• Mr. Cox asked why the surrounding signs did not match the recommendations• Ms. Jones indicated that code enforcement could force them to comply.• Mr. Cox asked why he was required to have less signage with less wording, but other signs with longer names could have more signage.• Mr. Petruziello answered that the board has discretion and that the size of the sign should be appropriate with the façade.	
motion by	Mr. Fleming / Mr. Petruziello To approve the proposal with the following conditions	
motion	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• 8" thick blade sign• Blade sign be limited to 6sf. per side• Mounting brackets should be covered with a scutcheon or aluminum plate• The raceway should be painted to match the brick.• Maximum lettering height of 16" for Domino's sign.	
vote	7 - 0 to Approve	
2. address	2160 North High Street	CVS
app no.:	UID_18-11-004	
applicant:	Tracey Diehl	
reviewed:	Signs	
4:20 – 4:35		
Staff report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Petruziello recused himself from the case.• Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.• Ms. Diehl presented the proposal. <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Fleming stated that he appreciated that the signs were no longer on the insets, but felt the current lettering crowded the band. He acknowledge that relative visibility and the prominence of the building on the corner did matter, but that it did not warrant 33 inches. Perhaps something larger than 16, but not 33.• Ms. Diehl asked if 24 inches would be appropriate.• Mr. Fleming replied that he would have to see the proposal at 24 inches.• Mr. Reeds asked if there was a sign on the chamfered corner.• Ms. Diehl answered that yes there was. It totaled 34 inches from top to bottom. The CVS lettering was 17	

<p>discussion:</p> <p>motion</p>	<p>inches.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fleming stated that it showed that the CVS on the corner could go down to 16 and meet the requirements. • Ms. Jones agreed with Keoni and felt that the difference between white and red had a significant effect. White seemed much larger than red. How large was appropriate would require the applicant to produce additional renderings at a new proposed size? • Ms. Uhaus-Sauer added that the minute clinic sign was very visible at its current size and setting. She asked what the red sign was. • Ms. Diehl answered that it was a window sign. • Mr. Grado asked if there wasn't a maximum window size. • Mr. Teba mentioned that he saw maximums on the rear but not on the rest of the structure. • Ms. Diehl asked to table and come back with another design. <p>Tabled.</p> <p>To consider:</p> <p style="padding-left: 40px;">To reduce the size of the signage.</p>
<p>3. address</p> <p>app no.:</p> <p>applicant:</p> <p>reviewed:</p> <p>4:35 – 4:50</p> <p>Staff Report:</p> <p>discussion:</p> <p>Motion by:</p> <p>motion</p> <p>Vote:</p>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <p>1572 North High Street</p> <p>Coffee Connections</p> </div> <p>UID_18-11-005</p> <p>Oliver Holtsberry / DaNite Sign Co.</p> <p>Signs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Holtsberry presented the proposal <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Grado stated that he supported staff's recommendation • Mr. Fleming stated that he supported staff's recommendation, but requested the anchor bolts be covered. • Mr. Petruziello stated that he felt there should be some leniency, due to the difficult nature of the retail location. It is far from the street and they should be allowed some opportunity to be seen. • Ms. Jones agreed stating that the sign was set back from High Street. • Mr. Holtsberry stated that there are projecting signs that do exceed six square feet. • Ms. Jones acknowledged that there was a lot of activity in the alley now that World of Beer was there, but that the activity needed to be supported. • Mr. Reeds added that the sign was competing with a lot of other stuff such as trees and posts, etc... • Mr. Fleming conceded on the size of the sign but requested that the bolts be covered. <p>Ms. Jones / Ms. Uhas</p> <p>To approve the proposal with the following conditions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bolts be covered. <p>7-0 to approve</p>
<p>4. address</p> <p>app no.:</p> <p>applicant:</p> <p>reviewed:</p> <p>4:50 – 5:10</p> <p>Staff Report:</p> <p>discussion:</p>	<div style="display: flex; justify-content: space-between;"> <p>1350 North High Street</p> <p>Kroger</p> </div> <p>UID_18-11-006</p> <p>David Hodge / Kroger Co.</p> <p>Exterior building alteration</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello recused himself from the case. • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Hodge presented the proposal. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fleming asked why they didn't consider moving the bus stop to the green space to the north. • Mr. Hodge replied that there were issues with bus queuing. • Mr. Reed asked what the intent was regarding the location of the bus stop • Mr. Hodge answered that the bus stop could move out into the right-of-way, but the bench and the canopy would come off the building.

- Mr. Fleming stated that the client was initially acting under good intentions, however, it didn't work out as intended.
- Mr. Hodge replied that across the street there is a mental/health treatment facility that is adding to the issue.
- Mr. Fleming replied that removal of the bench and canopy was penalizing too many people. There should be more of an exchange.
- Ms. Uhas Sauer stated that she would support it since it was an interim solution.
- Mr. Grado asked if they could just remove the bench and leave the canopy.
- Mr. Hodge replied that Kroger was not trying to be unreasonable and that perhaps it made sense as an interim step.
- Ms. Uhas Sauer added that the elderly would need a bench.
- Ms. Jones stated she would look for more landscaping or another form of exchange. Removal of the bench was a deal breaker.
- Mr. Reeds added that having a bus stop without a cover was too brutal. A bus stop similar to what was across the street was a possibility, but he preferred the Kroger bus stop. He is sympathetic that what is occurring is not good.
- Mr. Hodge added that it wasn't just bad for Kroger, but for everyone.
- Ms. Jones replied that it was Kroger who was selling the liquor.
- Mr. Hodge replied that was true, but it was also Kroger who worked with the board to have the building situated in its current orientation.
- Mr. Fleming stated that he agreed that the gesture was done with the best intentions, however, he did not feel that the solution was to just remove the entire stop. He would like to find a solution to the problem that doesn't hurt the people using the stop but would modify the stop.
- Mr. Hodge replied that he was working with COTA to find a solution that removed the stop from the building and moved it out closer to the street.
- Mr. Fleming replied that if he saw drawings showing a free-standing bus shelter out in the ROW on a site plan he would be fine with that.
- Ms. Jones stated that her main issue was that they were penalizing people who weren't a problem.
- Mr. Hodge replied that he admitted Kroger was selling liquor, but that there safety issues concerning everyone.
- Mr. Papineau supported the proposal. He did not feel that it was Kroger's responsibility to provide a bus stop. He felt it was Cota's responsibility.
- Mr. Fleming replied that the problem is that Kroger is trying to move backwards. It was part of the agreement that allowed them to put the building on that site, in that location, with that parking lot.
- Mr. Hodge replied that it was a negotiated agreement, but that the current building was a much greater improvement over the previous building.
- Ms. Uhas Sauer stated that she didn't feel that the issue could be solved tonight, but that the board should vote on the motion to get the solution started.
- Mr. Fleming replied that he disagreed. They should have a site plan showing their solution.
- Mr. Jones stated that he felt the bus stop should be retained but modified.

Motion by:

Tabled.

Motion:

To consider:

- To return with more details after discussion with Kroger.

5. address
app no.:
applicant:
reviewed:
5:10 – 5:25

15 East Lane
UID_18-07-005
Rob Ferguson (United Acquisition Services, Inc.)
Rooftop Antennas

Verizon

Staff Report:

- Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.
- Mr. Ferguson presented the proposal.

discussion:

- Mr. Petruziello asked why the antennas could not be lowered 6 to 8 feet.
- Mr. Ferguson said he could take that comment back to the engineer.
- Mr. Grado asked why it couldn't be pushed back.
- Mr. Ferguson answered that if he pushed them back, then they have to be raised higher.
- Mr. Reed asked if the intent was that if you are walking at the base of the building you should be receiving a signal, or is the intent broader
- Mr. Ferguson answered that it was both, but if the antenna gets halfway blocked, then you begin to lose signal.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Petruziello stated that if the antennas were lower, and had the horizontal bars removed, then it would be better.• Ms. Kerry asked why they didn't do a tower in the middle of the roof.• Mr. Ferguson replied that they couldn't do that because the roof is wooden.• Mr. Petruziello asked to see the wiring on the back of the building and suggested it be placed into the corner and boxed in.• Mr. Grado asked if it couldn't go on another building.• Mr. Ferguson stated that it is the tallest building.• Ms. Jones indicated that if the drawings were more detailed it would provide greater clarity.	
Motion by:	Tabled.	
Motion:	To consider: To return with more detailed drawings with lower antennas.	
6. address	139-141 West Ninth Avenue	Multi-Family
app no.:	UID_18-09-007	
applicant:	Michael Church	
reviewed:	Addition	
5:25 – 5:31		
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.• Mr. Church presented the proposal.	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Fleming indicated that the applicant had met the board's requests.• Ms. Jones agreed.	
Motion by:	Ms. Jones / Mr. Grado	
Motion:	To approve the proposal as presented.	
	7-0 to approve	
7. address	124 West 8 th Avenue	Mixed Use
app no.:	UID_18-11-007	
applicant:	Bradley Blumensheid / DKB architects	
reviewed:	Addition	
5:31-5:45		
Staff Report:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions.• Mr. Blumensheid presented the proposal.	
discussion:	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Mr. Papineau asked Mr. Teba if he wanted to explain why staff was recommending lowering the number of required parking spaces.• Mr. Teba explained that by removing the additional parking, they would no longer need a variance to the rear yard landscaping.• Mr. Fleming asked if the applicant would need a variance to the amount of parking they are requiring.• Mr. Teba replied that they would.• Ms. Jones stated that she supported less parking.• Mr. Blumensheid stated that they wanted additional parking for marketability.• Mr. Grado said he wouldn't give up the parking for 5% landscaping.• Mr. Reeds asked if they intended to have a parking space per bedroom.• Mr. Blumensheid replied that they did not.• Mr. Reeds felt that they should discourage cars and have a better yard.	
Motion by:	Ms. Jones / Mr. Grado	
Motion:	To approve the variances as presented.	
	7-0 to approve	

<p>8. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 5:45-6:00</p>	<p>1770 Indianola Avenue UID_18-11-008 Jeff Brown & Mitch Acock / ZACO Inc. Conceptual - New Construction</p>	<p>Sorority</p>
<p>Staff Report:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Acock presented the proposal. 	
<p>discussion:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello stated that he felt the dormers were too tall, and the overhangs were too tiny. • Mr. Fleming indicated asked if the cast iron on the roof could be reduced. • Mr. Acock replied that it was the applicant's symbol and it was a row of owls. • Ms. Jones stated that she felt it distracted from the overall design, as it was the only black on the building. • Mr. Acock replied that the grillage was important to the client and it was a minor detail that shouldn't be taken out of context. • Ms. Uhas Sauer stated that the grillage wasn't a problem to her, but what was more important should be the quality of materials and design. • Mr. Acock said he agreed with some of the feedback regarding the overhangs. 	
<p>9. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 6:00-6:20</p>	<p>1806-1886 North High Street UID_18-11-009 Campus Partners New Construction</p>	<p>Mixed Use</p>
<p>Staff Report:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fleming recused himself from the case. • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Keith Myers, Chris Meyers, and Tom Rieland presented the proposal. 	
<p>discussion:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello asked about why the High Street Facades where ordinary, while the plaza facades were much more embellished. • Ms. Jones added that the model gave a better representation through depth and layering. She felt that while the Edwards building was flat, these buildings had a much greater sensibility of layering and skins. These buildings looked much better than Edwards and the Gateway. The buildings have a sense of gravity and weight through their materials and proportions which will improve as they involve. • Mr. Petruziello replied that he felt the building was already a finished product and was no longer going to evolve. He was concerned that the buildings would not be vibrant, but institutional. • Mr. Myers said there was an attempt to create a variety of materials and form on the High Street façade. He felt that a great deal of the vibrancy would come from the storefront details. • Mr. Petruziello asked if there would be another Target style façade. • Mr. Myers replied that there would be smaller shops and restaurants that would allow for al-fresco dining. • Ms. Jones stated that she felt the design of the WOSU building was fantastic. • Ms. Uhas Sauer added that this has been a very long process, and at every step there has been a running dialogue. Everything that has been articulated by the board has been translated into what is seen in the proposal. She does not see the High Street façade as institutional, rather elegant. It isn't heading in the right direction, rather it is the right direction. She is ready to vote and support it. • Mr. Myers added that there have been 72 public votes in favor of the proposal, and only 8 against. • Mr. Reeds stated that he felt it was a remarkable project. High Street deserves big buildings, and these buildings are very elegant. It has the potential to be a real destination in the city. 	
<p>Motion by: Motion:</p>	<p>Ms. Jones / Mr. Reeds To approve the proposal as presented.</p> <p>5-0 to approve</p>	

<p>10. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 6:20-6:30</p>	<p>28-32 East 14th Avenue UID_18-11-010 Campus Partners New Construction</p>	<p>WOSU</p>
<p>Staff Report:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Fleming recused himself from the case. • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Keith Myers, Chris Meyers, and Tom Rieland presented the proposal. 	
<p>discussion:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ms. Jones stated that she really liked the perforated metal around the main entrance off the plaza. She wished there was more of it. • Mr. Myers replied that it was part of their branded logo and it did extend into the building. • Mr. Petruziello asked if they were also approving the building. • Mr. Myers said that they were. 	
<p>Motion by:</p>	<p>Ms. Jones / Mrs. Uhas Sauer</p>	
<p>Motion:</p>	<p>To approve the proposal as presented.</p>	
	<p>5-0 to approve</p>	
<p>11. address app no.: applicant: reviewed: 6:30-6:50</p>	<p>2500 North High Street UID_18-06-008 George Berardi (Berardi Partners) Mixed Use Redevelopment</p>	<p>Mixed Use</p>
<p>Staff Report:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Teba presented a staff report and slides of the site location and existing site conditions. • Mr. Berardi and Jonathan Leonard presented the proposal. 	
<p>discussion:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Petruziello asked why the applicant decided to keep the white. • Mr. Berardi replied that he felt that it offered a distinguishing difference between the colors on the building. • Ms. Jones stated that the white felt like an abstraction that lacked texture and looked flat. • Mr. Petruziello asked what the gaps were going to be on the panels. • Mr. Berardi stated that they were limited to a two-foot-high panel. They try to make them match the windows. • Mr. Petruziello said he would like the white better if it had more joints. • Mr. Berardi said they could add that if they wanted. • Ms. Jones said that if they articulated the panels and made them more off-white, sage, or gray, it would help. • Mr. Berardi said he liked that idea and you could put the panels in either vertically or horizontally. • Mr. Petruziello said horizontal worked better. • Ms. Jones felt it was odd that the portion of the building furthest back was the lightest. She asked if the black was also cement board. • Mr. Berardi replied that it was black brick. • Mr. Petruziello asked if the fake wood around the entrance could be even faker and more cartoonish. • Mr. Berardi said that was possible. • Mr. Petruziello stated he was concerned with the fake wood extending down to the ground. • Mr. Berardi stated they could bring them 6-8 inches off the ground by placing a black edge around the bottom of the planters. • Mr. Fleming asked if they were doing green roofing. • Mr. Berardi said they weren't. • Ms. Jones asked about the rectangular tree boxes. She didn't like it. She preferred trees in street grills. • Mr. Fleming said they had similar plantings on High Street and the Arena District. • Mr. Reeds said that tree grills were inferior. The boxes provide greater planting volume and protect from the salting of the streets. The bigger the open containers the better. • Ms. Jones asked if you had an 18-inch planter box. • Mr. Reeds said that was too high in the right-of-way. The back edge could make sense, but it could be a safety issue. The height isn't what will make the trees healthy, it is the volume of soil and keeping salt out of it. 	
	<p>Mr. Jeremy Stone is a resident in the area.</p>	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mr. Stone voiced concern that the building looked like it was from the Arena District and would be dated in a few years. There is nothing about this proposal that speaks to the Old North character. Brickwork would fit 	

better in Old North. He likes modern architecture, but this doesn't fit into the area.

- Ms. Jones asked if they had tried red brick.
- Mr. Petruziello said he felt the black brick would look better than it does in the rendering.
- Mr. Fleming stated that architecture changes over time. He likes the architecture in the area, but a building built in 2018 shouldn't look like a building from 100 years ago. The proposal is using a lot of brick which is something you don't see in many areas of the city.
- Ms. Jones added that they also agreed to keep the building on Tompkins. What they are proposing is better than what currently exists on the site.
- Mr. Stone stated that they could have done little things, like limestone under the windows. It could fit into the neighborhood a little bit better by incorporating smaller elements.
- Mr. Petruziello said it was incorporating elements of the neighborhood related to scale, proportion, and rhythm. The board is not ignoring the neighborhood character when they support a building like this, the board is just seeing it in a slightly different way.
- Mr. Berardi stated that he wanted to stress that they have taken note of the last conversation the Board had related to the changes to Lux Bell. He assured the board they would make sure such a change would not happen with the current proposal.
- Mr. Leonard added that they made sure that what was being submitted could be constructed.

Motion by:

Mr. Petruziello/ Mr. Fleming.

Motion:

To approve the proposal as presented.

6-0 to approve

D.

6:50- 6:52

Staff Issued Certificates of Approval

Items approved:

- | | | |
|-----|---|----------------|
| 1. | UID_18-11-001_COA
1489 North Fourth Street | Doors |
| 2. | UID_18-11-002_COA
306-308 19 th Avenue | Siding |
| 3. | UID_18-11-011
14-18 West Norwich Avenue | Roof |
| 4. | UID_18-11-012
247 Chittenden Avenue | Windows |
| 5. | UID_18-11-013
182 East Norwich Avenue | Windows |
| 6. | UID_18-11-014
176-178 East Norwich Avenue | Windows |
| 7. | UID_18-11-015
170 East Norwich Avenue | Windows |
| 8. | UID_18-11-016
164 East Norwich Avenue | Windows |
| 9. | UID_18-11-001_COA
1489 North Fourth Street | Doors |
| 10. | UID_18-11-002_COA
306-308 19 th Avenue | Siding |
| 11. | UID_18-11-011
14-18 West Norwich Avenue | Roof |
| 12. | UID_18-11-012
247 Chittenden Avenue | Windows |
| 13. | UID_18-11-013
182 East Norwich Avenue | Windows |

E.

Board Approved Applications Issued Certificates of Approval

- | | | items approved | COA issued |
|----|--|----------------|------------|
| 1. | UID_18-09-010_COA
1980 North High Street | Signs | 11/6/2018 |

F.

Next Meeting

- | | |
|----|---|
| 1. | December 20, 2018 111 North Front Street, Room 204 4:00pm |
|----|---|

